arXiv:1612.03383v1 [math.GR] 11 Dec 2016

A SURVEY OF CONFIGURATIONS

AKRAM YOUSOFZADEH

Abstract. The present paper is an expository account of the notion of configurations and related topics, including amenability, paradoxical decomposition and the group theoretical properties.

1. Introduction

The theory of configurations that we are going to describe, began in 2001 when J. M. Rosenblatt G. A. Willis and published a paper entitled *Weak Convergence is Not Strong Convergence for Amenable groups*. Using some features of the Cayley graph of a group, coloring this graph and giving an equivalence condition for amenability, they presented the first construction of nets which are weak-* converging to invariance but not strongly converging to invariance.

This concept has also applications to other algebraic structures such as semigroups and hypergroups and results in amenability of a class of Banach algebras, known as Lau algebras. We begin with an overview of theory, by giving the definitions and fundamental theorems. The application of this theory to characterization of group properties is given in sections 2, 3 and 4. In section 5 we apply configurations to construct paradoxical decompositions of non-amenable groups and to determine new upper bounds for the Tarski's numbers. Section 6 is devoted to a short summary of studies about the configuration of semigroups and hypergroups.

2. Preliminaries

To any finite ordered subset and any partition of a group one can associate a set of tuples of positive integers that can describe the group's behavior. Theses tuples which are called configurations, are important from the computational point of view.

Let $\mathfrak{g} = \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ be a finite subset of a group G and $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$ be a finite partition of G. The ordered Cayley graph $Cay(G, \mathfrak{g})$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}$, has vertices being the elements of G and directed edges connecting the elements h_1 to h_2 for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Color the vertices of $Cay(G, \mathfrak{g})$, such that all vertices in E_i are given the same distinct color. This way, the Cayley graph is categorized into finitely many classes which define *configurations*.

Each configuration corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ is an $(n+1)$-tuple $C = (C_0, C_1, \dots, C_n)$ with $C_k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that there is a set of elements $x_0, x_1 \dots x_n \in G$ which for each $j = 1, \dots, n$ we have $x_j = g_j x_0$. Obviously the elements $x_0, x_1 \dots x_n$ are not necessarily unique. x_0 is called a based point and each x_j is called a branch point for C. Despite the fact that there may be infinitely many tuples $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ which define a same configuration, there are only a finite number of configurations.

Let C be a configuration. Consider the set of all base points or equivalently the set of all elements of G that can be placed in the position of x_0 for a configuration C and denote this set by $x_0(C)$. Clearly these sets are disjoint, when the corresponding configurations are diverse. These sets are the key points to almost all proofs.

Example 2.1. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}$ be the additive group of integer numbers. Put $g_1 = 1, g_2 = 2$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, E_2\}$, where $E_1 = 3\mathbb{Z}$, $E_2 = 3\mathbb{Z} + 1$, and $E_3 = 3\mathbb{Z} + 2$. Then the set of configurations corresponding to $\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}$ consists of*

$$C_1 = (1, 2, 3), C_2 = (2, 3, 1) \quad \text{and } C_3 = (3, 1, 2).$$

Here we have $x_0(C_1) = E_1, x_0(C_2) = E_2$ and $x_0(C_3) = E_3$.

A locally compact group G is called amenable group if it admits a left invariant mean on $L^\infty(G)$. That is a normalized nonnegative functional M on $L^\infty(G)$ such that $M(1) = 1$ and $M(f) \geq 0$ whenever $f \geq 0$ and $M({}_a f) = M(f)$, for each $a \in G$ and $f \in L^\infty(G)$.

Let $P(G)$ denote the positive functions $f \in L^1(G)$ such that $\int_G f d\lambda = 1$. If $f \in P(G)$, define f_C to be the sum of all values of f on the set $x_0(C)$, i.e.

$$f_C = \sum \{f(x),\ x \in x_0(c)\}.$$

A system of equations corresponding to configurations related to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$, stating that for the color i and for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the sum of all f_C with base point of i-th color, should be the sum of all f_C with j-th branch point and the same color i, is called the system of configuration equations and denoted by $Eq(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$. Indeed this system is defined through

$$\sum \{f_C,\ x_0(C) = i\} = \sum \{f_C,\ x_j(C) = i\}, \qquad (1 \leq j \leq n,\ 1 \leq i \leq m).$$

It is proved that the solutions to this system depend only the values of the string (f_C) and not of the function $f \in P(G)$. Therefor to solve the system we shall only look for strings (f_C) of real numbers, satisfying the equations. This solution is called normalized if $f_C \geq 0$ for each C and $\sum f_C = 1$.

That $Eq(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ does not have non-zero solution, provide us a useful tool to investigate and compare non-amenable groups. We shall give some explanations in section 5 below.

The existence of normalized solution is intimately close to the amenability of groups. Indeed

Theorem 2.2. [18, Theorem 2.4] *There is a normalized solution of every possible instance of the configuration equations if and only if G is amenable.*

This theorem is the radix of many results proved during the years after 2001. Clearly, the word normalized can be replaced by nonzero nonnegative, here. But even more has been proved: There is a nonzero solution of every possible instance of the configuration equations if and only if G is amenable. (see [1]).

The aim of the work of Rosenblatt and Willis was to present appropriate nets which are weak* converging to invariance; i.e., a net (f_α) in $P(G)$ such that $\langle f_\alpha -_g f_\alpha, F\rangle$ tends to zero for any $F \in L^\infty(G)$ and every $g \in G$. If G is an infinite locally compact group, varying partitions $\mathcal{E}$ and finite subsets $\mathfrak{g}$ of G, and taking normalized solutions to each $Eq(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$, the desired net (f_α) in $P(G)$ can be constructed.

Theorem 2.3. [18, Theorem 2.9] *If G is an infinite discrete amenable group, then there exists a net (f_α) in $P(G)$ converging weak* to invariance, such that for any $e \neq x \in G$, $\|f_\alpha -_x f_\alpha\|_1 = 2$.*

3. How configurations can characterize group properties

Amenability of a discrete group G is equivalent to the amenability of all finitely generated subgroups of G (every group is a direct union of its finitely generated subgroups and direct union of amenable group is amenable). Throughout this section we assume that the group G is finitely generated and we state the properties that can be characterized through the coincidence of the set of configurations.

If $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are as in the pervious section, we call $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ a configuration pair. The set of all configurations corresponding to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ is denoted by $Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})$ and called a configuration set. By $Con(G)$ we mean the set of all possible configuration sets of G.

Sometimes, it is useful to go from one element of $Con(G)$ to another one, by switching the generator $\mathfrak{g}$ or the partition $\mathcal{E}$. For example it is important in many considerations below, that a special element of G (mostly e_G) belongs to a specified member of $\mathcal{E}$ so that the configuration set $Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})$ does not differ. It is actually possible. Indeed, for any partition $\mathcal{E}$ and element $x \in G$ we have $Con(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}) = Con(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}')$, where $\mathcal{E}' = \{E_1 x, \ldots, E_m x\}$.

We say that two groups G and H are configuration equivalent and write $G \approx H$, if

$$Con(G) = Con(H).$$

Several properties of groups is clearly passed through the configuration equivalence. For instance, configuration equivalence groups have the same minimum number of generators. Also according to the Theorem 2.2, one of them is amenable if and only if the other one is.

In the following cases, an appropriate selection of a configuration set $Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})$ would show that two specified configuration equivalent groups are isomorphic.

Let G be finite. Selecting $\mathfrak{g}$ the ordered generating set of G and $\mathcal{E}$ the most refined partition of G, i.e., the set of all singletons of elements of G, an elementary proof shows that $G \approx H$ implies $G \cong H$ (see the proof of [2, proposition 4.3]). Configuration equivalence can also specify some other group theoretical properties of groups. We list them as follow referring directly to [2] and [22].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathbb{F}_n$ be the free group of positive rank n. If H is a finitely generated group such that $H \approx \mathbb{F}_n$, then $H \cong \mathbb{F}_n$.*

If for a periodic group H, $G \approx H$, then G must be periodic as well. Indeed

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a finitely generated group having an element of infinite order. Then there is a partition, $\mathcal{E}$, of G and a generating set $\mathfrak{g} = (g_1, \ldots, g_n)$ such that $Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})$ is not a configuration set of any periodic group.*

Let n be a positive integer and S be the free semigroup on the set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Suppose that $\mu = \mu(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $\nu = \nu(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ are two elements in S. We say that $\mu = \nu$ is a semigroup law in a group G if for every n-tuple $(g_1, \ldots, g_n)$ of elements of G, we have $\mu(g_1, \ldots, g_n) = \nu(g_1, \ldots, g_n)$. For example G is abelian if and only if the semigroup law $xy = yx$ is satisfied. The following theorem causes the stability of certain group properties of configuration equivalent groups.

Theorem 3.3. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two finitely generated groups with $G_1 \approx G_2$. Then G_1 and G_2 satisfy the same semigroup laws.*

So if G_1 is abelian, then so is G_2. For this case, the isomorphism is also concluded:

Theorem 3.4. *Let G be a finitely generated non-abelian group. Then there is a partition, $\mathcal{E}$, of G and a generating set $\{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n\}$ such that the corresponding configuration set cannot arise from an abelian group. Moreover if G_1 and G_2 are finitely generated abelian groups such that $G_1 \approx G_2$, then $G_1 \cong G_2$.*

As the nilpotency of groups of a certain class can be stated by the language of semigroup laws (see [10]), we have the following

Theorem 3.5. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two finitely generated groups with $G_1 \approx G_2$. Suppose that G_1 is nilpotent of class c. Then G_2 is nilpotent of class c.*

This result has been improved recently. It is proved in [12] that two configuration equivalent groups obey the same group laws.

Proposition 3.6. *Let G and H be two groups with $G \approx H$ and suppose that G satisfies the group law $\mu(x_1, ..., x_n) = e_G$. Then H satisfies the same law.*

Corollary 3.7. *Let G and H be two groups such that $G \approx H$. Then the solubility of G is equivalent to H's. Furthermore, their derived lengths are the same.*

For the rest of this section, we mention the results concerning the quotient groups. For a group G, we denote by $\mathcal{F}(G)$ and $\mathcal{A}(G)$ the set of isomorphism classes of finite and abelian quotients of G, respectively. Let us begin with the following two theorems from [2] and [3].

Theorem 3.8. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two finitely generated groups with $G_1 \approx G_2$. Then G_1 and G_2 have the same set of finite quotients. In other words, if G_1 has a normal subgroup, N_1, with finite index. Then G_2 has a normal subgroup N_2 with $G_2/N_2 \cong G_1/N_1$; i.e. $\mathcal{F}(G_1) = \mathcal{F}(G_2)$*

Proposition 3.9. *Let G and H be finitely generated groups such that $G \approx H$. Then $\mathcal{A}(G_1) = \mathcal{A}(G_2)$.*

As a direct application of Theorem 3.9, we point out that for two arbitrary configuration equivalent groups G and H, $\frac{G}{G'} \cong \frac{H}{H'}$ (See [22]).

Let G be a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group of class 2. Denote by $T = T(G)$ the isolator of G' in G, i.e. the set of all elements $x \in G$ such that $x^s \in G'$ for some nonzero integer s. The set T is a central subgroup of G and T/G' is the torsion subgroup of G/G'. Then there exist positive integers m and n such that $G/T \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $T \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$. The class of all such groups G shall be denoted by $\mathcal{I}(n, m)$ (see [20], p. 260). If $G \in \mathcal{I}(n, m)$ and $G \approx H$, then H is a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group of class 2, as well. So $H \in \mathcal{I}(n', m')$ for some positive integers n' and m'. It is seen that $n = n'$ and $m = m'$. For the particular case, when $(n, m) \in \{(3, 2), (3, 3), (n, 1)\}$, it is well known that if $G, H \in \mathcal{I}(n, m)$ and G and H are not isomorphic, then they have different classes of finite quotients. Thus the following theorem obtained.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $G \in \mathcal{I}(n, m)$ and $G \approx H$ for some finitely generated group H. If $(n, m) \in \{(3, 2), (3, 3), (n, 1)\}$, then $G \cong H$.*

Now $Tr(3, \mathbb{Z}) \in \mathcal{I}(2, 1)$. So if G is a finitely generated group such that $Con(G) = Con(Tr(3, \mathbb{Z}))$, then $G \cong Tr(3, \mathbb{Z})$.

Following Theorem 3.5, it is naturally asked wether the configuration equivalence of two nilpotent groups necessities them being isomorphic. This question is investigated for nilpotent FC-groups in [3].

An FC-group is a group in which each element has finitely many conjugates. A finitely generated group G is an FC-group if and only if $G/Z(G)$ is finite, where $Z(G)$ is the center of G. Also If G is a finitely generated FC-group, then G is isomorphic with a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}n \times F$, for some finite group F. (see [24]).

It is shown in [24] that for each finitely generated FC-group G, the torsion subgroup $Tor(G)$, and commutator subgroup G' of G are finite and therefore the factor group $G/Tor(G)$ is an abelian torsion free group.

For a group G the non cancelation set, $\chi(G)$ is the set of isomorphism classes of groups H such that $G \times \mathbb{Z} \cong H \times \mathbb{Z}$. If the commutator subgroups of the groups G and H are finite, then $\mathcal{F}(G) = \mathcal{F}(H)$ necessities them to have the same cancelation sets (see [27, Theorem 2.1]). So configuration equivalent groups have equal cancelation sets. Using these facts the following theorem is followed

Theorem 3.11. *Let $Con(G) = Con(\mathbb{Z}_n \times F)$, where F is a finite group and G is an FC-group. Then $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_n \times F$.*

A polycyclic group is a solvable group that satisfies the maximal condition on subgroups (that is, every subgroup is finitely generated). Polycyclic groups are finitely presented, and this makes them interesting to work. Equivalently, a group G is polycyclic if and only if it admits a subnormal series with cyclic factors, that is a finite set of subgroups, let's say $G_0, \ldots, G_n$ such that G_0 coincides with G, G_n is the trivial subgroup, G_{i+1} is a normal subgroup of G_i (for every i between 0 and $n-1$) and and the quotient group G_i/G_{i+1} is a cyclic group (for every i between 0 and $n-1$).

Proposition 3.12. *Let G and H be two polycyclic groups such that $G \approx H$. If G admits a normal series with infinite cyclic factors, then H is torsion free.*

In a polycyclic group G the number of infinite factors in a cyclic series, which is known as the *Hirsch* length, is independent of the series and is an invariant of G.

By induction on the nilpotency class of a torsion free nilpotent group G, we can see that if $G \approx H$, then H is also a torsion free nilpotent group with the same Hirsch length of G.

Theorem 3.13. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent FC-group and $G \approx H$. Then H is a nilpotent FC-group too. Furthermore $Z(G) \cong Z(H)$ and $G/Z(G) \cong H/Z(H)$. Also G and H have the same Hircsh length.*

Definition 3.14. Let F_m denote the free group of rank m on set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$. For a fixed n, let F_m^n denote the subgroup of F_m generated by g^n for all $g \in F_m$. Then F_m^n is a normal subgroup of F_m and we define the Burnside group $B(m,n)$ to be the quotient group $\frac{F_m}{F_m^n}$.

Burnside groups can also presented via generators and relations. Novikov and Adyan presented the group $B(m,n)$ as follows (see [17])

$$B(m,n) = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_m; w^n = 1 \rangle.$$

Using this form, we have the next theorem

Theorem 3.15. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $Con(B(m,n)) = Con(B(m',n'))$.
(ii) $m = m', n = n'$.
(iii) $B(m,n) = B(m',n')$.

The concept of golden configuration pair is defined through the next notation and definition which is initiated by the authors in [12]. The existence of a golden pair can guaranty the isomorphism of some sorts of groups, provided that they have the same set of configurations (see proposition 3.17 below).

Notation. *Let G be a group with $\mathfrak{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$ as its generating set. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $J \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}^p$ and $\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}^p$. Denote the product $\prod_{i=1}^{N} g_{J(i)}^{\sigma(i)}$ by $W(J, \sigma; \mathfrak{g})$. The pair (J, σ) is called a representative pair on $\mathfrak{g}$ and $W(J, \sigma; \mathfrak{g})$ a word corresponding to (J, σ) in $\mathfrak{g}$. The representative pair (J, σ) is called reduced, if $\sigma(i) = \sigma(i+1)$, whenever $J(i) = J(i+1)$.*

Definition 3.16. Let G be a group. We call a configuration pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ golden, if for each configuration pair $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathcal{E}')$ for G with $\mathcal{E}' = \{E_1', \dots, E_m'\}$, $e_G \in E_1'$ and $\mathrm{Con}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{Con}(\mathfrak{g}', \mathcal{E}')$, we have the following implication:

$$W(J, \sigma; \mathfrak{g}) \neq e_G \Rightarrow W(J, \sigma; \mathfrak{g}') \notin E_1'$$

in which (J, σ) is a representative pair.

For the details of the proof of the following proposition see [12].

Proposition 3.17. *Let G be a Hopfian group with a golden configuration pair and H be a group such that $G \approx H$. Then G is finitely presented if and only if H is finitely presented, and in the case that G has a finite set of defining relators, we have $G \cong H$.*

Two groups G and H are *strong configuration equivalence* written as $(G; \mathfrak{g}) \approx_s (H; \mathfrak{h})$, if there exist ordered generating sets $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ for G and H respectively, such that 1) For each partition $\mathcal{E}$ of G there exists a partition $\mathcal{F}$ of H such that $\mathrm{Con}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{Con}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{F})$ and 2) For each partition $\mathcal{F}$ of H there is a partition $\mathcal{E}$ of G such that $\mathrm{Con}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{F}) = \mathrm{Con}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$. In [12] it is proved that this version of configuration equivalence for two groups is exactly the isomorphism of them:

Theorem 3.18. [12, Theorem 4.3] *Two groups are strong configuration equivalence if and only if they are isomorphic.*

4. Two-sided configurations

To investigate the behavior of a group in some cases, we need to know how a special element acts from both left and right sides. In this section, we give a new type of configurations which depends on the left and right translations and we shall give a review of results in [16].

Definition 4.1. Let G be a finitely generated group. Given a generating sequence $\mathfrak{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$ and a partition $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$ of G, a two-sided configuration corresponding to the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ is an $(2n+1)$-tuple $C = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{2n})$ satisfying

(i) $c_i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ for each $0 \leq i \leq 2n$, and

(ii) there exists $x \in E_{c_0}$ such that $g_i x \in E_{c_i}$ and $x g_i \in E_{c_{i+n}}$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

We denote by $Con'(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ the set of all two-sided configurations corresponding to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$, and let

$$Con'(G) = \{Con'(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}) : \quad (\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}) \text{is a configuration pair for G}\}.$$

Attend to the point that two definitions of configurations are different. For example, if $G = S_3$, $\mathfrak{g} = (g1; g2; g3)$ with $g_1 = (12), g_2 = (13), g_3 = (23)$, and $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, E_2\}$ with $E_1 = \{g_1\}$ and $E_2 = G \setminus E_1$, then one may prove quite simply that $G = \langle g_1, g_2, g_3 \rangle$ $Con'(g; E) \neq Con'(h; F)$ and it is clear that $Con(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E}) = Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{F})$ (see [16]). This example shows that there is no direct correspondence between one-sided and two-sided configuration sets for the given generators and partition. It is naturally asked if there exist groups G_1 and G_2 so that $G_1 \approx G_2$ but $Con'(G_1) \neq Con'(G_2)$.

We call two groups G_1 and G_2 two-sided configuration equivalent if $Con'(G_1) = Con'(G_2)$. It is obvious that if $Con'(G_1) = Con'(G_2)$, then $Con(G_1) = Con(G_2)$. Therefore, every conclusion obtained before, for configuration equivalent groups is true for two-sided configuration equivalent groups. Clearly if G_1 and G_2 are belian, then the two concepts are the same.

In the pervious section we saw that the equivalence of configurations of two finitely generated groups, implies that they have the same finite quotients. It is not difficult to find examples to prove that the converse is not correct. In the following, two polycyclic groups are given in this direction.

Let $K = Q(\sqrt{10})$ be as a number field of degree 2, and $O = \mathbb{Z} + \sqrt{10}\mathbb{Z}$ the ring of integers of K. Also, let $O_1 = 3\mathbb{Z} + (1 + \sqrt{10})\mathbb{Z}$ and $O_2 = O$ be ideals which are in distinct ideal classes of O. If $u = 3 + p10$, then u is a unit element of infinite order in O. For $i = 1, 2$, choose a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for O_i, and let x_i be the matrix corresponding to multiplication by u with respect to this basis. According to above statements,

$$x_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \quad x_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 10 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that x_1 is not similar to x_2 in $GL2(Z)$. For if there exists a matrix $P = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in GL_2(Z)$ such that $Px_2 = x_1P$, then we will have $a + 10b = 3c$, $a + b = 3d$ and $detP = ad - bc = \pm 1$. Therefore, $10b^2 - C = a^2$ or $10b^2 + 3 = a^2$. Both of them are impossible because no square number can be in the form $10b^2 \pm 3$. By a similar way, we can also prove that $x_1 - 1$ and x_2 are not similar in $GL_2(Z)$ and so $\langle x_1 \rangle$ and $\langle x_2 \rangle$ are not conjugate in $GL_2(Z)$. For details, see [20, p. 256].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $G_i = \mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes_{\rho_i} \langle x_i \rangle$, where $\rho_i \in Aut(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $\rho_i(m,n) = x_i(m,n)$ for $i = 1,2$ and $m,n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then G_1 is not isomorphic to G_2, but $\mathcal{F}(G_1) = \mathcal{F}(G_2)$. (Note that these groups are torsion free polycyclic.)*

This observation leads us to have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *There exist non-isomorphic polycyclic torsion free groups G_1 and G_2 such that $Con'(G_1) \neq Con'(G_2)$ and $\mathcal{F}(G_1) = \mathcal{F}(G_2)$.*

Let $G_1 * G_2$ denote the free product of two groups G_1 and G_2. Each element g of $G_1 * G_2$ can be uniquely written in the form $g = g_1 g_2 \dots g_r$, where $r \geq 0,\ 1 \neq g_i \in G_{n_i}$, $n_i \in \{1,2\}$ and $n_i \neq n_{i+1}$. The case $r = 0$ is interpreted as $g = 1$ (see [17, pp. 161-178]).

The following theorem is obtained by direct uses of definition (see [16]).

Theorem 4.4. *Let F be a finite group and H be a finite group or an infinite cyclic group such that $Con'(G) = Con'(H * F)$. Then $G \cong H * F$.*

Let $G = F_m$ and $H = F_n$ be two finite rank free groups. Then their free product is again a finite rank free group F_{m+n} (see [17, p. 164]), and so if $Con(K) = Con(G * H)$, then $K \cong G * H$ by [2].

In section 3 we recalled some results concerning nilpotent groups. Here we note that each finitely generated nilpotent group is isomorphic to a subgroup of $Tr(n;Z) \times F$ for some positive integer n and a finite nilpotent group F, where $Tr(n;Z)$ is the group of $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over $\mathbb{Z}$ (see [18, p. 158]). The following theorem, solves the problem of two-sided configuration equivalences and isomorphisms for this case.

Theorem 4.5. [16, Theorem 3.5] *Let G be a finitely generated group such that*

$$Con'(G) = Con'(Tr(n;\mathbb{Z}) \times F),$$

where F is a finite group. Then $G \cong Tr(n;\mathbb{Z}) \times F$.

Let N be a normal subgroup of a group G. A partition $\mathcal{E}$ of G, is called a *quotient partition*, if it is an inverse image of a partition of G/N under the quotient map; In other words, there exits a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of G/N, such that $\mathcal{E} = q^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) := \{q^{-1}(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$. If a refinement $\mathcal{E}'$ of a quotient partition $\mathcal{E}$ of G is itself quotient, we say $\mathcal{E}'$ is a *quotient refinement* of E. By a *quotient configuration pair*, we mean a configuration pair $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{E})$ in which $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a quotient extension generating set and $\mathcal{E}$ is a quotient partition of G.

Definition 4.6. Let G be a group with a normal subgroup N and a quotient configuration pair $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{E})$. We say that $(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{E})$ is *recognizable* w.r.t N, if $\mathrm{Con_t}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathrm{Con_t}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}, \mathcal{F})$, for a configuration pair $(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}, \mathcal{F})$ of a groups H , then for every $g \in G \setminus N$, there is a representative pair, (J_g, σ_g) such that

$$g = W(J_g, \sigma_g; \hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \quad \text{and} \quad W(J_g, \sigma_g; \hat{\mathfrak{h}})F \cap F = \emptyset$$

where $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is in the same color as an element of $\mathcal{E}$ which contains N.

It is shown that if G is a finitely presented Hopfian group with a recognizable configuration pair, and H be a group with $Con'(G) = Con'(H)$, then $G \cong H$. Also it is proved that every polycyclic group has a recognizable configuration pair. Therefore we have the following important proposition:

Proposition 4.7. *Let G be a polycyclic group and $Con'(G) = Con'(H)$ for a finitely generated group H. Then $G \cong H$.*

We know [21, section 9.3; Proposition 3.4] that every finitely generated nilpotent group is polycyclic Therefore for two-sided configuration equivalent groups G and H such that G is nilpotent, we have $G \cong H$. However, a more general result has been obtained:

Theorem 4.8. [13, Theorem 5.3] *Let G be a polycyclic–by–finite group, such that $Con'(G) = Con'(H)$ for a finitely generated group H. Then $G \cong H$.*

We investigated the configuration equivalence of nilpotent FC-groups in section 3. These groups have finite commutators. Theorem 3.13 is extended in the following sense.

Theorem 4.9. *Let G be a finitely generated group having finite commutator subgroup. Assume that $Con'(G) = Con'(H)$ for a group H. Then $G \cong H$.*

In particular if G is a finitely generated FC-group, which $Con'(G) = Con'(H)$ for a group H. Then $G \cong H$ (see [13] and [24]).

The main question of section 3 is '*Does the configuration equivalence imply the isomorphism of groups?*' Recently, this question is answered negatively (see [14]). In that paper the authors give an example including two soluble groups which are two-sided configuration equivalent (and hence configuration equivalent) but they are not isomorphic. Therefor the main question is not correct even for amenable groups.

Theorem 4.10. *There exist non-isomorphic finitely generating groups with the same two-sided configuration sets.*

5. PARADOXICAL DECOMPOSITIONS

A discrete group G is amenable if it admits a G-invariant finitely additive probability measure, that is a map $\mu : P(G) \to [0, 1]$ defined on the set $P(G)$ of all subsets of G such that $\mu(A \bigsqcup B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B)$ for disjoint subsets A and B of G, $\mu(gA) = \mu(A)$ for $g \in G$ and $A \subseteq G$ and $\mu(G) = 1$, where $\bigsqcup$ is disjoint union and $gA = \{ga : \ a \in A\}$ for $g \in G$ and $A \subseteq G$. It is well known that the non-amenability of discrete groups is characterized by the existence of paradoxical decompositions. We recall the definition of this concept through the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. [15, proposition 1.2] *Let G be a group. Then the following statements are equivalent*

1) There exist a partition $\{A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$ of G and $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ and

$h_1, \dots, h_m$ in G such that $\{g_jA_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{h_jB_j\}_{j=1}^m$ form partitions of G.

2) There exist pairwise disjoint subsets $A_1, \dots A_n, B_1, \dots, B_m$ of G and elements $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and $h_1, \dots, h_m$ in G such that $\{g_jA_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{h_jB_j\}_{j=1}^m$ form partitions of G.

3) There exist pairwise disjoint subsets $A_1, \dots, A_n, B_1, \dots, B_m$ of G and elements $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and $h_1, \dots, h_m$ in G such that

$$G = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} g_jA_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} h_jB_j$$

(not necessarily pairwise disjoint).

We say that G admits a complete paradoxical decomposition, if condition (1) of Proposition (1.2) holds. The number $\tau = n + m$ for n and m in the previous definition is called the Tarski number of that paradoxical decomposition; the minimum of all such numbers over all the possible paradoxical decompositions of G, is called the Tarski number of G and denoted by $\tau(G)$. In the case that there is no paradoxical decomposition, we set $\tau(G) = \infty$ (see [17]).

The rest of this section is a procedure to construct a paradoxical decomposition of a given group, using a system of configuration equations with no nonnegative nonzero solution. We omit the proofs but for the sake of importance, we point out that the proof of the main theorem of this section is strongly based on the following two lemmas. For details see [15].

Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ is given and put

$$A_i^j = \{C \in Con(g, E) : \ x_j(C) \subseteq Ei\}, \quad (1 \leq i \leq m, \ 1 \leq j \leq n).$$

It is clear that for each $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $A_1^j, \dots, A_m^j$ is a partition of $Con(g, E)$.

Lemma 5.2. *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $j, j' \in \{0, \dots, n\}$,*

$$g_{j'}^{-1} g_j \Big(\bigcup_{C \in A_i^j} x_0(C) \Big) = \Big(\bigcup_{C \in A_i^{j'}} x_0(C) \Big).$$

Gordan's Theorem [7, 2.13] says that for any given matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $m < n$, exactly one of the following systems has a solution:
(1) $AX = 0$ for some nonzero and non-negative $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
(2) $Y^tA > 0$ for some $Y \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

A slight modification of this theorem follows the next lemma immediately.

Lemma 5.3. *If the system $Eq(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ has no nonnegative nonzero solutions and $AX = 0$ is the corresponding system, then by row operations, A can be changed into an equivalent matrix B with nonnegative entries and no zero column.*

Definition 5.4. Let A and B be as in above Lemma and L_i^j be the coefficient vector of the equation

$$\sum_{x_j(C)\subseteq E_i} f_C = \sum_{x_0(C)\subseteq E_i} f_C = 0.$$

We say that $Eq(\mathfrak{g},\mathcal{E})$ satisfies the paradoxical condition if each row of B is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{m} R_i$, where $R_i \in \{L^j_{i'}, -L^j_{i'}, L^j_i - L^k_i : \quad 1 \leq j,k \leq n\}$ and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} L^1_1 \\ \vdots \\ L^n_1 \\ \vdots \\ L^1_m \\ \vdots \\ L^n_m \end{pmatrix}$$

In other words, each row of B is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{m}(L^{j_i}_i - L^{k_i}_i)$, for some $j_i, k_i \in \{0,\ldots,n\}$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let G be a finitely generated group. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be an ordered finite generating set for G and $\mathcal{E}$ a finite partition of G. Suppose that the associated system of configuration equations $Eq(\mathfrak{g},\mathcal{E})$ admits no nonzero nonnegative solution and satisfies the paradoxical condition. Then G admits a paradoxical decomposition in terms of $(\mathfrak{g},\mathcal{E})$.*

A glance at the proof of the pervious theorem in [15], help us get a new upper bound for the Tarski numbers of the groups under consideration. It is noticeable that in comparison with former results, this bound is not the most precise one, but is stated in terms of configurations and from this point of view is valuable to us. See the next corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Let $Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E})$ be a configuration set of group G satisfying the paradoxical condition and $|Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E})| = l$. Then $\tau(G) \leq l + \delta^r$, where $d = l^2$. Hence $t(G) \leq l + l^{2l}$.*

Remark 5.7. In [28], the authors clarified the proof of the the theorem 5.5 and initiated the concept of *configuration graph* to construct the paradoxical decomposition of a non-amenable discrete group using a system of configuration equations admitting no nonnegative non-zero solution. A short look at the proof of Theorem 5.5 shows that it is too complicated to work with. The configuration graph explains this proof step by step and make it applicable.

It is easily seen that for two configuration equivalent groups G_1 and G_2, that G_1 is amenable if and only if G_2 is. In other words, $\tau(G_1) = \infty$ if and only if $\tau(G_1) = \infty$. The next theorem states that this result is true even for non-amenable groups.

Theorem 5.8. [28, Theorem 3.8] *Let G_1 and G_2 be groups such that $Con(G_1) = Con(G_2)$. Then $\tau(G_1) = \tau(G_2)$.*

This concludes in particular that one of the configuration equivalent groups contains a non-abelian free group if and only if the other one does (see, for example, [19, Theorem 5.8.38]).

6. Other algebraic structures

Configurations are definable for some algebraic structures other than groups. Abdollahi and Rejali introduced this concept for semigroups [1]. They initiated paradoxical decompositions, generalized Theorem 2.2 and extended the Tarski alternative for semigroups. The notion of configuration for hypergroups can be found in [26]. In the latter paper for a hypergroup with a left Haar measure, the author gives the definition of configuration. Extending the last main results, he provides a new characterization of left amenability of Lau algebras.

6.1. **Semigroups.**

Definition 6.1. Let S be a discrete semigroup and $\mathfrak{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$ be a generating sequence of S and $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$ be a partition of S. An $(n+1)$-tuple $C = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n)$, where $c_i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, is called a left configuration corresponding to the configuration pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$, if there exists an element $x \in S$ with $x \in E_{c_0}$ such that

$$g_i x \in E_{c_i}, \text{ for each } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

The set of all left configurations corresponding to the configuration pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ will be denoted by $Con_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$.

Define

$$x_0(C) = E_{c_0} \cap g_1^{-1} E_{c_1} \cap \cdots \cap g_n^{-1} E_{c_n}$$

and $x_j(C) = g_j x_0(C)$, where for $A \subseteq S$ and for a member s in S we put

$$s^{-1}A := \{t \in S : st \in A\}.$$

It can bee seen that $\{x_0(C) : \ C \in Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})\}$ is a partition of S. The set of all $Con_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$is denoted by $Con_\ell(S)$.

Completely similar to the group case, the left configuration equation corresponding to the configuration pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ is the system of equations,

$$\sum_{C \in Con_\ell(S)} \{f_C : \ x_j(C) \subseteq E_i\} = \sum_{C \in Con_\ell(S)} \{f_C : \ x_0(C) \subseteq E_i\}, \tag{1}$$

where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. This system of equations will be denoted by $Eq_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$. A solution $\{f_C | \ C \in Con_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})\}$ to $Eq_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ satisfying

$$\sum\{f_C : \ C \in Con_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})\} = 1 \text{ and} f_C \geq 0, \text{ for all } C \in Con_\ell(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$$

will be called a normalized solution of the equation system (1).

Recall that a semigroup S is called left amenable, if there exists a left invariant mean M on $\ell^\infty(S)$ such that $M(xf) = M(f)$, for all $f \in \ell^\infty(S)$ and $x \in S$, where $\ell^\infty(S)$ denotes the set of all real-valued bounded functions on S.

Let S be a finitely generated discrete semigroup. In the following proposition, Theorem 2.2 is generalized for any semigroup S.

Proposition 6.2. *The following statements are equivalent.*
(i) S is left amenable,
(ii) Each left configuration equation $Eq(\mathfrak{g}, \mathcal{E})$ has a normalised solution.

Paradoxical decompositions for semigroups can be defined and investigated out of the area of configurations. But because of the similarity and relation between this concept and configurations in the case of groups, they are stated here.

Definition 6.3. Let $\{A_1, \ldots, A_n; B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$ be a partition of S such that there exist two subsets $\{g_1, \ldots, g_n\}$ and $\{h_1, \ldots, h_m\}$ of S with the following property

$$\begin{aligned} S &= A_1 \cup A_2 \cup ... \cup A_n \cup B_1 \cup ... \cup B_m \\ &= g_1^{-1}A_1 \cup g_2^{-1}A_2 \cup ... \cup g_n^{-1}A_n \\ &= h_1^{-1}B_1 \cup h_2^{-1}B_2 \cup ... \cup h_m^{-1}B_m. \end{aligned}$$

Then we say that S has a left paradoxical decomposition. The left Tarski number of S (denoted by $\tau_\ell(S)$) is the minimum of $m+n$, over all possible left paradoxical decomposition of S. If S has no left paradoxical decomposition, we put $\tau_\ell(S) = \infty$.

It is easily seen that the least Tarski number ever for semigroups is 2. Moreover if $S = (\mathbb{N}, .)$ and $x.y = x$ for $x, y \in S$, then $\tau_\ell(S) = 2$. For more details see ([1, Example 3.6]).

Using a method as in [11, p.117], one shall prove the following theorem. By this theorem which is a result in [1], the authors extend the Tarski's theorem for semigroups which was asked in [4, p. 120].

Theorem 6.4. *The following statements are equivalent.*

(i) S is left amenable,
(ii) There exists no left paradoxical decomposition for S.

6.2. **Hypergroups.**

Definition 6.5. [5] A hypergroup is a locally compact space H with the following conditions

(1) There exists an associative binary operation $*$ called convolution on $M(H)$ under which $M(H)$ is an algebra. Moreover, for every x, y in H, $x * y$ is a probability measure with compact support.

(2) The mapping $(x, y) \mapsto \delta_x * \delta_y$ is a continuous map from $H \times H$ into $M(H)$ equipped with the weak* topology.

(3) The mapping $(x, y) \mapsto supp(\delta_x * \delta_y)$ is a continuous mapping from $H \times H$ into the compact subsets of H equipped with the Michael topology.

(4) There exists a unique element e in H such that $\delta_e * \delta_x = \delta_x * \delta_e = \delta_x$ for all x in H.

(5) There exists a homeomorphism $x \mapsto \check{x}$ of H called involution satisfying $\check{\check{x}} = x$ for all $x \in H$ and $(\delta_x * \delta_y)^{\check{}} = \delta_{\check{x}} * \delta_{\check{y}}$ for all $x, y \in H$, where $\check{\mu}(A) = \mu(\check{A})$, for any Borel subset A.

(6) e belongs to $supp(x * y)$ if and only if $y = \check{x}$.

Definition 6.6. Let H be a hypergroup with left Haar measure λ. Let $E = \{E_1, \ldots, E_m\}$ be a finite measurable partition of H and choose an n-tuple of elements of H, $h = \{h_1, \ldots, h_n\}$. A configuration is an $(n+1)$-tuple $C = (C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n)$ where each $C_j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

For a fixed configuration, C, we define $\xi_0(C)$ to be the real-valued function on H given by

$$\xi_0(C)(x) := \prod_{j=0}^{n} \delta_{h_j} * \delta_x(E_{C_j})$$

here we convent that $h_0 = e$. So we express $\xi_0(C)$ as

$$\xi_0(C) = \prod_{j=0}^{n} \delta_{\check{h}_j} * \chi_{E_{C_j}}.$$

Hence we see that $\xi_0(C)$ is the pointwise product of finitely many non-negative measurable functions bounded by 1 and so is itself in $L_1(H)^+$ and is norm bounded by 1.

Definition 6.7. Let $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ be fixed. Let $\{z_C \ : C \in Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})\}$ be variables corresponding to the m^{n+1} configurations. Consider the $m \times n$ configuration equations

$$\sum_{C \in Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E}), C_0 = i} z_C = \sum_{C \in Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E}), C_j = i} z_C$$

for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We say that a solution to these configuration equations is positive if, for each $C \in Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})$, $z_C \geq 0$; normalized if $\sum_{C \in Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E})} z_C = 1$; and inequality preserving if for every choice of m^{n+1} real numbers $\{\alpha_C : \ C \in Con(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})\}$,

$$0 \leq \sum_{C \in Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E})} \alpha_C \xi_0(C) \ a.e. \Rightarrow 0 \leq \sum_{C \in Con(\mathfrak{h},\mathcal{E})} \alpha_C \ z_C.$$

A hypergroup H is said to be amenable if there exists a positive linear functional M of norm 1 on $C(H)$ which is invariant under left translation. In other words,

$$M(f) = M(\delta_x * f) \qquad (x \in H, \ f \in C(H)),$$

where for $\mu \in M(H)$ and any Borel function f we define

$$\mu * f(x) = \check{\mu} * \delta_x(f).$$

Let the hypergroup H be amenable with a left invariant mean M. suppose that $\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E}$ are given as before. For any configuration corresponding to $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathcal{E})$, put $z_C = M(\xi_0(C))$. Then by an easy argument, one can see that $\{z_C, \quad C \text{ is a configuration}\}$ is a positive, normalized inequality preserving solution for the corresponding configuration equations. The converse direction is also correct but not so easy to reach. For details see [26, Theorm 2.6].

Theorem 6.8. [26] *Let H be a hypergroup with left Haar measure λ. H is amenable if and only if for all choices of $m, n, \mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ the $m \times n$ configuration equations have a positive, normalized, inequality preserving solution.*

6.3. **Amenability of Lau algebras.** Let A be a Banach algebra and X a Banach A-bimodule. Then X^* is a Banach A-bimodule under the actions:

$$\langle a.m, f\rangle = \langle m, f.a\rangle, \quad \langle m.a, f\rangle = \langle m, a.f\rangle \qquad (a \in A, f \in X, m \in X^*).$$

A derivation $D : A \to X$ is a (bounded) linear map such that

$$D(ab) = D(a).b + a.D(b) \quad (a, b \in A).$$

The derivation D is inner if it is of the form $a \to a.f - f.a$ a for some $f \in X$. The cohomology space $\mathcal{H}^1(A, X)$ is the quotient of the space of derivations by the inner derivations. The Banach algebra A is amenable if, for every Banach A-bimodule X, $\mathcal{H}^1(A, X^*) = \{0\}$.

A Lau algebra is a pair (A, M) such that A is a complex Banach algebra and M is a W^*-algebra which A is its predual, that is $A = M_*$ and furthermore, the identity element of M, denoted by e, is a multiplicative linear functional on A. When there is no chance of confusion, we denote the pair (A, M) simply by A. Theses algebras were introduced by Lau in 1983. In the original paper [9], Lau called them F-algebras. This class of Banach algebras including group algebra, Fourier and Fourier Stieltjes algebra of a locally compact topological group and also the measure algebra of a locally compact hyperhroup has been of interest of many harmonic analysis

researchers. In [9] the left amenability of F-algebras is given and several characterization of that is presented. Another characterization is based on the concept of configuration in a special sense which we shall review here. For details see[26].

Suppose that A is a Lau algebra. $P(A)$ denotes the cone of all positive linear functionals in A (as a subset of A^{**}) and $P_1(A)$ denotes the functionals ϕ in $P(A)$ such that $\phi(e) = 1$.

Definition 6.9. Let (A, M) be a Lau algebra. Let $(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n) \in (P_1(A))^n$ and $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\} \subseteq M$ such that each $f_i \geq 0$ and $\sum i = 1^m f_i = e$. We define an (A, M)-configuration as an ordered choice $C = (C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_n)$ with each $C_j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and define $\xi_0(C)$ via:

$$\xi_0(C) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} f_{C_j}.\phi_j.$$

Here $\cdot$ represents the dual module action of A on M.

When the multiplication in M is non-commutative, we assume that the multiplication is done left to right as j goes from 0 to n. For $\phi \in A$ we define

$$\phi_C = \langle \xi_0(C), \phi \rangle.$$

Define the configuration equations as before as the mn equations in the m^{n+1} variables (z_C corresponding to the configuration C) as

$$\sum_{C_0=i} z_C = \sum_{C_j=i} z_C.$$

A solution to the configuration equations is again said to be positive if each $z_C \geq 0$, normalized if $\sum_C z_C = 1$ and inequality preserving if for any choice of real numbers $\{\alpha_C\}$

$$0 \leq \sum_C \alpha_C \xi_0(C) \Rightarrow 0 \leq \sum_C \alpha_C z_C.$$

Let A be a Lau algebra. A topological left invariant mean on A^* is an element $m \in P_1(A^{**})$ such that

$$m(x.\phi) = m(x) \quad \phi \in P_1(A),\ x \in A^*.$$

A is called left amenable if for any two-sided Banach A-module X such that

$$\phi.x = \phi(e)x \quad \phi \in A, x \in X,$$

every bounded derivation from A into X^* is inner.

It is shown in [9] that a Lau algebra is left amenable if and only if A^* has a topological left invariant mean. Using this fact and applying a similar method as in theorem 6.8, Willson proved the following theorem.

Theorem 6.10. *A Lau algebra (A, M) is left amenable if and only if for all choices of $(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n) \in (P_1(A))^n$ and $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\} \subseteq M$ such that each*

$f_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{m} f_i = e$ the associated (A, M)-configuration equations have a positive, normalized, inequality preserving solution.

7. further Notes

The construction of paradoxical decomposition in section 5 is recently purified by the author. A matrix combinatorial property is given so that the paradoxical decomposition is neatly obtained. In that paper there are some suggestions for constructing groups with certain Tarski numbers. For details see [29]. The notion of paradoxical decomposition is not easily extended for hypergroups but a similar definition has been defined by the author. The existence of this subject is equivalence to the non-amenability of the hypergroup [30].

As might be expected, in a relatively young area of research there is still work to be done. We point out some questions that can be the subject of upcoming researches.

• A group is called virtually free if it has a free subgroup of finite index. If G is a virtually free group and H has the same (two-sided) configurations as G, is G isomorphic to H?

• What is the answer of above question for an arbitrary Burnside group?

• If two groups are (two-sided) configuration equivalent, what can we say about their amenable quotients?

• Using configuration equations with no normalized solution, how can we construct a paradoxical decomposition for the underling semigroup?

• What is the relation between the set of configurations of a topological group and the sets of configurations of its group algebra and Fourier algebra as Lau algebras?

• Like Lau algebras, can some one define the notion of configuration for an arbitrary Banach algebra and characterize any kind of amenability of that algebra?

Acknowledgement The author would like to thank professor Ali Rejali for his suggestion of writing this paper.

References

[1] A. Abdollahi, A. Rejali *Paradoxical Decomposition of Semigroups*, Semigroup Forum, **48** (2004) No. 3, 861–873.

[2] A. Abdollahi, A. Rejali and G. A. Willis,*Group properties characterized by configuration*, Illinois J. Mathematics, **48** (2004) No. 3, 861–873.

[3] A. Abdollahi, A. Rejali and A. Yousofzadeh, *Configuration of nilpotent groups and isomorphism*, J. Algebra Appl, **8**, No. 3 (2009) 339–350.

[4] Adler, A., and J. Hamilton, *Invariant means via the ultra power*, Math. Ann. **202** (1973), 71-76.
[5] W. R. Bloom and H. Heyer, *Harmonic analysis of probability measures on hypergroups, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics,* vol. 20, Walter de Gruyter Co., Berlin, 1995.
[6] T. G. Ceccherini-Silberstein, R. I. Grigorchuk and P. de la Harpe, *Amenability and paradoxical decompositions for pseudogroups and for discrete metric spaces*, Proc. Steklov. Inst. Math. **224** (1999), 57–97.
[7] G. B. Dantzig and M. N. Thapa, *Linear Programming 2: Theory and Extensions.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
[8] M. Ershov, G. Golan and M. Sapir,*The Tarski numbers of groups*, Adv. Math. **284** (2015) 21–53.
[9] A. T.-M. Lau, *Analysis on a class of Banach algebras with applications to harmonic analysis on locally compact groups and semigroups*, Fund. Math. **118** (1983), no. 3, 161-175.
[10] B. H. Neumann and T. Taylor, *Subsemigroups of nilpotent groups*, Proc. Roy. SOC. Ser. A **274** (1963), 1–4.
[11] Paterson, A. L. T., *Amenability. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 29, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.
[12] A. Rejali and M. Soleimani Malekan, *Strong Configuration Equivalence and Isomorphism.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.07209 (2015).
[13] A. Rejali and M. Soleimani Malekan, *Two-sided Configuration of Polycyclic Groups and Isomorphism.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03021 (2015).
[14] A. Rejali and M. Soleimani Malekan, *Configuration Equivalence is not Equivalent to Isomorphism.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.00781 (2016).
[15] A. Rejali and A. Yousofzadeh, *Configuration of groups and paradoxical decompositions*, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin **18** (2011) 157–172.
[16] A. Rejali and A. Yousofzadeh, *Group Properties Characterized by Two-sided Configurations*, Algebra Colloquium 17 (2010) **4** (2010) 583–594.
[17] D.J.S. Robinson, *A Course in the Theory of Groups*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
[18] J. M. Rosenblatt and G. A. Willis, *Weak convergence is not strong for amenable groups*, Canad. math. Bull, **44** (2001) No 2, 231–241.
[19] M. Sapir, *Combinatorial algebra: Syntax and Semantics.* Springer International Publishing, Suitzerland, 2014.
[20] D. Segal, *Polycyclic Groups*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1983.
[21] C. C. Sims, *Computation with Finitely Presented Groups*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
[22] a. Tavakoli, A. Rejali, A. Yousofzadeh and A. Abdollahi, *A note about configuration of a group.* **19** (1) (2001) 3-23.
[23] N. Q. Thang, *A note on finitely generated nilpotent groups*, Expo. Math. **19** (1) (2001) 3-23.
[24] M. J. Tomkinson, *FC-Groups,* 2nd. edn. Pitman Publishing Limited, London, 1984.
[25] S. Wagon, *The Banach-Tarski Paradox.*, vol. 24 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1985.
[26] B. Willson, *Configurations and invariant nets for amenable hypergroups and related algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014), no. 10, 5087–5112.
[27] P. J. Witbooi, *Generalizing the HiltonMislin genus group,* J. Algebra **239** (2001) 327-339.
[28] A. Yousofzadeh, A. Tavakoli and A. Rejali, *On configuration graph and paradoxical decomposition*, J. Algebra. Appl, **13**, No. 2 (2014), 1350086 (11 pages).
[29] A. Yousofzadeh, *Construction of paradoxical decompositions.* arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.01568 (2015).

[30] A. Yousofzade, *Tarski number of hypergroups*, submitted.